Achieving Shannon Capacity in a Wiretap Channel via Previous Messages

Shahid Mehraj Shah and Vinod Sharma
Department of Electrical Communication Engineering,
Indian Institute of Science,
Bangalore, India
Email: {shahid, vinod}@ece.iisc.ernet.in

arXiv:1404.5701v2 [cs.IT] 8 May 2015

***Abstract*—In this paper we consider a wiretap channel with a secret key buffer. We use the coding scheme of [1] to enhance the secrecy rate to the capacity of the main channel, while storing each securely transmitted message in the secret key buffer. We use the oldest secret bits from the buffer to be used as a secret key to transmit a message in a slot and then remove those bits. With this scheme we are able to prove stronger results than those in [1]. i.e., not only the message which is being transmitted currently, but all the messages transmitted in last N_1 slots are secure with respect to all the information that the eavesdropper possesses, where N_1 can be chosen arbitrarily large.**

***Index Terms*—Secret key, Physical Layer Security, Secrecy Capacity.**

I. Introduction

Wyner's seminal paper on wiretap channel [2] provided a coding scheme for achieving secrecy capacity for a degraded wiretap channel, i.e., when Eavesdropper's (Eve's) channel is degraded with respect to (w.r.t.) the main receiver's channel. If the main channel capacity is C and Eve's channel capacity is C_e, then Wyner proved that secrecy capcity is $C_s = C - C_e$. Thus there can be a substantial loss of rate due to the security constraint. More generally, a Broadcast channel with confidential messages was studies in [3], where Eve's channel is not assumed to be degraded. In [3], the authors have also shown the trade-off between secrecy and the achievable rate.

One way to overcome the rate loss is to use some shared secret key with rate R_K. Then the achievable secrecy rate is $\min\{C_m, (C_m - C_e + R_K)^+\}$ (Chapter 17, [4]). The first work on secret key generation is reported in [5]. In this paper the authors assume a public discussion channel for exchanging functions, and then to agree on a key. The eavesdropper "hears" the whole conversation. [6] discusses two types of models: Source type model and Channel type model. Secret key generation via the sources and channels was investigated in [7] and [8] and for multiple terminals in [9].

Wiretap channel with rate-distortion has been studied in [10].

Another technique to enhance the secrecy rate is the use of feedback as in [11] where the authors have considered the wiretap channel with secure rate limited feedback. This feedback is used to agree on a secret key. Wiretap channel with shared key was studied in [12].

Recently, a multiplex coding based wiretap coding scheme is proposed which also achieves secrecy rate equal to the main channel capacity [13]. In this work, as in [1], the authors have shown that each individual message is secure w.r.t. Eve's output. The coding schemes in [13] and [1] are different.

A slow fading wiretap channel with a secret key buffer was studied in [14]. The authors study the scenario where different secret messages are being transmitted in different slots and consider the equivocation of a message with the outputs of the channel to the eavesdropper in the same slot. In [15] the authors compute the equivocation of all messages with the outputs of the channel to the eavesdropper in all these slots. In this paper the authors have used a secret key buffer to leverage the secrecy capacity, i.e., when the main channel is worse than Eve's channel, secret key bits are used from the buffer to transmit a message using a one time pad scheme. The authors are not enhancing secrecy rate, rather they are trying to nullify the fluctuation in secrecy capacity.

Strong secrecy based secret key agreement was introduced in [16]. For a detailed survey of Information theoretic security reader can refer to [17].

In this paper we do not assume any public channel or feedback. As in [1], we use previous messages (which are transmitted securely) as key and also use wiretap coding, in a single slot to enhance the secrecy rate. After a finite number of slots we can achieve secrecy rate equal to the main channel capacity. Our scheme is much simpler than multiplex coding technique proposed in [13]. Also, unlike in [13] and [1], we show that at any time k, all messages transmitted in previous N_1 slots are securely transmitted while attaining secrecy rate equal to the main channel capacity. The N_1 can be taken as large as we wish. To do this, we use a secret key buffer, as in [15] but with the coding, decoding scheme of [1]. But unlike in [15] we increase secrecy capacity to Shannon capacity of the main channel and unlike in [1] we consider mutual information between all the messages transmitted in recent past with respect to all the data received by Eavesdropper.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: In Section II we present the system model and the coding/decoding scheme. In Section III we state the main theorem with proof. The paper concludes in Section IV. The proof of the two lemma's used in the proof of the theorem is provided in an appendix.

A note about the notation: capital letters, like W will denote a random variable and the corresponding small letter w its realization. An n-length vector $(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)$ will be



Fig. 1. The Wiretap channel

denoted as A^n. Information theoretic notation will be same as in [4].

II. Channel Model And Problem Statement

We consider a discrete time, memoryless, degraded wiretap channel, where Alice wants to transmit messages to Bob. There is an eavesdropper (Eve) who is passively "listening"(Fig. 1). We want to keep Eve ignorant of the messages.

Formally, Alice wants to communicate messages $W \in \mathcal{W} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{nR_s}\}$ reliably over the Wiretap channel to Bob, while ensuring that Eve is not able to decode them. Here R_s is the secrecy capacity of the wiretap channel defined as

$$R_s = \max_{p(x)} \left[I(X;Y) - I(X;Z) \right]. \tag{1}$$

We assume $R_s > 0$. The transition probability matrix of the channel is $p(y, z|x)$. At time i, X_i is the channel input and the legitimate receiver (Bob) and Eve receive the channel outputs Y_i and Z_i respectively, where $X_i \in \mathcal{X}, Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}, Z_i \in \mathcal{Z}$. The messages W_m are generated uniformly from $\mathcal{W}$ and $\{W_m, m \geq 1\}$ is an independent sequence. One or more messages are encoded into an n length codeword. A mini-slot consists of n channel uses. In our scheme, the first slot consists of only one mini-slot. From next slot onwards a slot has $(M+1)$ minislots where M is a large positive integer. Let C be the capacity of Alice-Bob channel and $[x]$ denote the integer part of x. For simplicity, we take $\frac{C}{R_s}$ as integer. The message $\overline{W}_k$ to be transmitted in slot k consists of one or more messages W_m. The codeword for message $\overline{W}_k$ is denoted by $\overline{X}_k$. The corresponding received bits by Eve are $\overline{Z}_k$. To increase the secrecy rate, the transmitter uses previous messages as the key for transmitting the message in a later slot.

The message $\overline{W}_k$ transmitted in slot k is stored as key in a key buffer (of infinite length) for later use. After certain bits from the key buffer are used as a key for data transmission, those bits are discarded from the key buffer not to be used again. Let B_k be the number of bits in the key buffer at the beginning of slot k. Let R_k be the number of key bits used in slot k from the key buffer. Then

$$B_{k+1} = B_k + |\overline{\mathcal{W}}_k| - R_k \tag{2}$$

where $|\overline{\mathcal{W}}_k|$ denotes the number of bits in $\overline{W}_k$. Now we explain the coding-decoding scheme used in this paper.

A. Encoder:

To transmit message $\overline{W}_k$ in slot k, the encoder has two parts

$$f_s : \mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{X}^n, f_d : \mathcal{W}^M \times \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{X}^{nM}, \tag{3}$$

where $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{K}$ is the set of secret keys generated and f_s is the wiretap encoder, as in [2]. For f_d one can use various encoders studied for transmission with secret key. We use the following: Take binary version of the message and XOR with the binary version of the key. Encode the resulting encrypted message with an optimal usual channel encoder. Assume that the key buffer at time 0 is empty. In the first slot a message encoded using the wiretap coding only is transmitted. At the end of slot 1, nR_s bits of this message are stored in the key buffer. Thus $B_1 = R_s n$. In slot 2, message $\overline{W}_2$ consisting of two messages $(\overline{W}_{21}, \overline{W}_{22}) = (W_2, W_3)$ are transmitted. W_2 is transmitted via wiretap coding and W_3 uses $\overline{W}_1$ as a key and the encrypted message $\overline{W}_1 \oplus W_3$ is transmitted via a usual capacity achieving channel code (e.g., an LDPC or a turbo code can be used in practice). At the end of slot 2, $R_s n$ bits of $\overline{W}_1$ are removed from the key buffer and $2R_s n$ bits of $\overline{W}_2$ are stored in the buffer key. Since Bob is able to decode $\overline{W}_1$ with a large probability, but not Eve, $\overline{W}_1$ can be an effective key in slot 2. In slot 3, message $\overline{W}_3$ consisting of 3 messages from the source message sequence are transmitted: one message in the first mini slot denoted as $W_{3,1}$ via wiretap coding and two messages denoted together as $\overline{W}_{3,2}$ via encryption with the message $\overline{W}_2$ as key bits. In slot k $(\overline{W}_k = (\overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k,2}))$ an extra message from the source stream is transmitted (thus in slot k, k messages are transmitted, $(k-1)R_s n$ bits from the key buffer are removed in the beginning of slot k and $kR_s n$ bits are added to the key buffer at the end of slot k). This continues till slot $M+1$. From slot $M+1$ onwards $M+1$ messages are transmitted in the above mentioned fashion.

We use the key buffer as a first in first out (FIFO) queue, i.e., at any time the oldest key bits in the buffer are used first. Also $B_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Since we cannot transmit at a rate higher than Bob's capacity C, the maximum number of messages that can be transmitted in a slot is $1 + \frac{C}{R_s} M$ (this is because in the first minislot using wiretap coding we can transmit only at rate R_s and in the rest of the M minislots at most at rate C). Once we reach this limit, from then onwards $1 + \frac{C}{R_s} M$ messages will be transmitted in a slot. Thus the maximum secrecy rate achievable in a slot via our coding-decoding scheme is $\frac{R_s + CM}{M+1}$ which can be made as close to C as we wish by making M arbitrarily large.

Decoder

For decoding at Bob, in slot 1 the usual wiretap decoder is used (say joint-typicality decoder). From slot 2 onwards, for the first minislot, we use the wiretap decoder while for rest of the minislots, we use the channel decoder (corresponding to the channel encoder used) and then XOR the decoded message with the key used.

We will denote by P_e^n the probability that any of the message transmitted in a slot is not received properly by Bob:

$P_e^n = Pr(\overline{W}_k \neq \widehat{W}_k)$ where $\widehat{W}_k$ is the decoded message by Bob in slot k.

For secrecy we consider the leakage rate $\frac{1}{n}I(\overline{W}_k, \overline{W}_{k-1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k)$ in slot k where N_1 is an arbitrarily large positive integer which can be chosen as a design parameter to take into account the secrecy requirement of the application at hand. Then of course we should be considering $k > N_1$. From [1], we know that $\frac{1}{n}I(\overline{W}_k; Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_k) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, for all $k \geq 1$. Our current criterion for secrecy is stronger:

$$\frac{1}{n} I\left(W_k, \ldots, W_{k-N_1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k\right) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \quad (4)$$

III. Capacity of Wiretap Channel

Theorem 3.1: The secrecy capacity of our coding-decoding scheme is C for all k large enough.

Proof: As mentioned in the last section, by using our coding-decoding scheme, using wiretap coding and secure key, in any slot k Bob is able to decode the message $\overline{W}_k$ with probability $P_e^n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Also, it is shown in [1], as our coding scheme satisfies the properties needed in [1], we can show that

$$\frac{1}{n} I(\overline{W}_k; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \to 0, \quad (5)$$

as $n \to \infty$. Since the key buffer $B_k \to \infty$, we use the oldest key bits in the buffer first and in any slot do not use more than $M\frac{C}{R_s}$ key bits, after sometime (say N_2 slots) for all $k \geq N_2$ we will be using key bits only from the messages $\overline{W}_1, \overline{W}_2, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1-1}$ for messages $(\overline{W}_k, \overline{W}_{k-1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ (due to wiretap coding), we can choose n such that $I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_{k,1}) \leq n\epsilon$ for all $k \geq 1$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\overline{W}_k, \overline{W}_{k-1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \\ &= I(\overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k-1,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \\ &\quad + I(\overline{W}_{k,2}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,2}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k | \overline{W}_{k,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We show in Lemma 1 that

$$I(\overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k-1,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \leq N_1 n\epsilon, \quad (7)$$

and in Lemma 2 that

$$I(\overline{W}_{k,2}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,2}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k | \overline{W}_{k,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}) = 0. \quad (8)$$

From (7), (8) and (6)

$$\frac{1}{n} I(\overline{W}_k, \overline{W}_{k-1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \leq N_1\epsilon. \quad (9)$$

By fixing N_1, we can take ϵ small enough that $N_1\epsilon$ is less than any desired value. □

Comment 1: So far we have been considering an infinite buffer system. But an actual system will have a finite buffer. Now we compute the key buffer length needed for our system. If we fix the probability of error for Bob and the upper bound on equivocation, then we can get the code length n needed. Also, from the secrecy requirement, we can fix N_1. Once n and N_1 are fixed, to ensure that eventually, in slot k we will use a key from messages before time $k - N_1$, the key buffer size should be $\geq CMN_1n$ bits. Also, since in each slot, the key buffer length increases by nR_s bits, the key buffer will have at least CMN_1n bits after slot $\frac{CMN_1}{R_s}$. In the finite buffer case eventually key buffer will overflow. We should loose only the latest bits arriving in any slot.

Comment 2: We can obtain Shannon capacity even with strong secrecy. For this instead of using the usual wiretap coding of Wyner in the first minislot of each slot we use the extractor technique of [18] and [19]. Then $I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_{k,1}) < \epsilon$ instead of $I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_{k,1}) \leq n\epsilon$ for n large enough. Then from proof of Theorem 3.1, our coding-decoding scheme provides

$$I(\overline{W}_k, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \quad (10)$$

IV. Conclusions

In this paper we have achieved secrecy rate equal to the main channel capacity by using previous secret messages as key for transmitting the current message. This can be done while still retaining *strong secrecy*.

Appendix A
Proof of Lemma

Lemma 1: The following holds

$$I(\overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k-1,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \leq N_1 n\epsilon. \quad (11)$$

Proof: We have,

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k-1,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \\ &= I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \\ &\quad + I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k | \overline{W}_{k,1}) + \ldots + \\ &\quad + I(\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k | \overline{W}_{k,1}, \ldots, \overline{W}_{k-N_1+1,1}). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) \\ &= I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_{k,1}) + I(\overline{W}_{k,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_{k-1}, \overline{Z}_{k,2} | \overline{Z}_{k,1}) \\ &\leq n\epsilon + 0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

because $(\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_{k-1}, \overline{Z}_{k,2}) \perp (\overline{Z}_{k,1}, \overline{W}_{k,1})$, where $X \perp Y$ denotes that random variable X is independent of Y.

Next consider

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; \overline{Z}_1, \overline{Z}_2, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k | \overline{W}_{k,1}) \\ &= I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; \overline{Z}_{k-1,1} | \overline{W}_{k,1}) \\ &\quad + I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; (\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) - \overline{Z}_{k-1,1} | \overline{W}_{k,1}, \overline{Z}_{k-1,1}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $(\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k) - \overline{Z}_{k-1,1}$ denotes the sequence $(\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k)$ without $\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} &I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; \overline{Z}_{k-1,1} | \overline{W}_{k,1}) \\ &= I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1}; \overline{Z}_{k-1,1}) \leq n\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Also, because $(\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2})$ is independent of $(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1})$,

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};(\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_k)-\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1})\\&=I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1})\\&\quad+I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_k,\overline{Z}_{k-1,2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots\overline{Z}_{k-2})\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\stackrel{(a)}{=}0+I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_{k,1}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots\overline{Z}_{k-2})\\&\quad+I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots\overline{Z}_{k-2},\overline{Z}_{k,1}).\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Furthermore, since $(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}) \perp (\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};Z_{k,1}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2})\\&=I(\overline{W}_{k-1};Z_{k,1}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}).\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

Using the fact that $(\overline{W}_{k-1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}) \perp (\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k,1})$ we can directly show that the right side equals zero.

Let A denote the indices of the slots in which messages are transmitted which are used as keys for transmitting $\overline{W}_{k,2}$ and $\overline{W}_{k-1,2}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}(\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2})&\leftrightarrow(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{W}_A)\\&\leftrightarrow(\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2}),\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

where $X\leftrightarrow Y\leftrightarrow Z$ denotes that $\{X,Y,Z\}$ forms a Markov chain, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2},\overline{Z}_{k,1})\\&\le I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{W}_A;\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1},\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-2},\overline{Z}_{k,1})\\&\stackrel{(a)}{\le}I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{W}_A;\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2})\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\le I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2})+I(\overline{W}_A;\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2}|\overline{W}_{k-1,1})\\&\stackrel{(b)}{=}0+I(\overline{W}_A;\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2})\stackrel{(c)}{=}0,\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

where (a) follows from (19), (b) follows since $(\overline{W}_{k-1,1},\overline{Z}_{k-1,1}) \perp (\overline{W}_A,\overline{Z}_{k,2},\overline{Z}_{k-1,2})$ and (c) follows since $\overline{W}_A \perp Z_{k,2},Z_{k-1,2}$.

From (14), (15), (18), (21),

$$I(\overline{W}_{k-1,1};\overline{Z}_1,\overline{Z}_2,\ldots,\overline{Z}_k|\overline{W}_{k,1})\le n\epsilon.\tag{22}$$

We can similarly show that the other terms on the right side of (6) are also upper bounded by $n\epsilon$. This proves the lemma.□

Lemma 2: The following holds

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\overline{W}_{k-1,2},\ldots\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_k|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1})=0.\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_k|\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1})\\&\quad=I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1}|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1})\\&\quad+I(\overline{W}_{k,2},,\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_{k-N_1},\ldots,\overline{Z}_k|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Since $\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1}$ is independent of $\overline{W}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1}$, the first term on the right equals

$$I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\overline{W}_{k-1,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1})=0.\tag{25}$$

The second term in the RHS of (24)

$$\begin{aligned}&=I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_{k-N_1},\ldots,\overline{Z}_k|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1})\\&=I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,1},\ldots\overline{Z}_{k,1}|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1},\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1})\\&+I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\overline{W}_{k-1,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\\&\qquad\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,2},\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k,2}|\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1},\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1},\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,1},\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k,1}).\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

The first term on the right is zero because $(\overline{W}_{k,2},\overline{W}_{k-1,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2})$ is independent of $(\overline{Z}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,1})$,$(\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1})$ and $\overline{Z}_1,\ldots\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1}$. Also since $(\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1})$ and $(\overline{Z}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,1})$ are independent of the other random variables in the second term on the right side, this term equals

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\overline{W}_{k,2},\overline{W}_{k-1,2},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,2};\overline{Z}_{k,2},\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1,2}|\\&\qquad\qquad\overline{Z}_1,\ldots,\overline{Z}_{k-N_1-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

For convenience we denote it as $I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2|\widehat{Z}_1)$ with $\widehat{W}_2$, $\widehat{Z}_2$, $\widehat{Z}_1$ denoting the respective sequences of random variables. Since

$$\begin{aligned}I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1,\widehat{Z}_2)&=I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1)+I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2|\widehat{Z}_1)\\&=I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2)+I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1|\widehat{Z}_2),\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

and we have

$$I(\widehat{W}_2,\widehat{Z}_1)=0=I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2),\tag{29}$$

and

$$\widehat{Z}_1\leftrightarrow(\widehat{W}_1,\widehat{W}_2)\leftrightarrow\widehat{Z}_2,\tag{30}$$

where $\widehat{W}_1=(\overline{W}_{k,1},\ldots,\overline{W}_{k-N_1,1})$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2|\widehat{Z}_1) &\overset{(a)}{=} I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1|\widehat{Z}_2)\\
&\leq I(\widehat{W}_1,\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1|\widehat{Z}_2)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(\widehat{W}_1,\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1)\\
&= I(\widehat{W}_1;\widehat{Z}_1) + I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1|\widehat{W}_1)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} 0 + I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_1), \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) follow from (29), (b) follows from (30) (c) follows from $\widehat{W}_1 \perp (\widehat{W}_2, \widehat{Z}_1)$. Also $\widehat{W}_2 \perp \widehat{Z}_1$. Therefore

$$I(\widehat{W}_2;\widehat{Z}_2|\widehat{Z}_1) = 0. \qquad (32)$$

From (25), (26) and (32), we get the lemma. □

REFERENCES

[1] S. M. Shah, S. Parameswaran, and V. Sharma, "Previous messages provide the key to achieve shannon capacity in a wiretap channel," in *Communications Workshops (ICC), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 697–701.

[2] A. D. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.

[3] I. Csiszar and J. Korner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, May 1978.

[4] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[5] S. M. Shah, S. Parameswaran, and V. Sharma, "Previous messages provide the key to achieve shannon capacity in a wiretap channel," in *Communications Workshops (ICC), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 697–701.

[6] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszar, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography. part i: secret sharing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, 1993.

[7] A. Khisti, S. N. Diggavi, and G. W. Wornell, "Secret-key generation using correlated sources and channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 652–670, 2012.

[8] V. M. Prabhakaran, K. Eswaran, and K. Ramchandran, "Secrecy via sources and channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 6747–6765, 2012.

[9] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan, "Secrecy capacities for multiterminal channel models," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 2437–2452, 2008.

[10] H. Yamamoto, "Rate-distortion theory for the shannon cipher system," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 827–835, 1997.

[11] E. Ardestanizadeh, M. Franceschetti, T. Javidi, and Y.-H. Kim, "Wiretap channel with secure rate-limited feedback," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5353–5361, 2009.

[12] W. Kang and N. Liu, "Wiretap channel with shared key," in *2010 Information theory Workshop, Dublin*, 2010.

[13] D. Kobayashi, H. Yamamoto, and T. Ogawa, "Secure multiplex coding attaining channel capacity in wiretap channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 8131–8143, Dec 2013.

[14] O. Gungor, J. Tan, C. E. Koksal, H. El Gamal, and N. B. Shroff, "Joint power and secret key queue management for delay limited secure communication," in *INFOCOM, 2010 Proceedings IEEE*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–9.

[15] O. Gungor, J. Tan, C. E. Koksal, H. El-Gamal, and N. B. Shroff, "Secrecy outage capacity of fading channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 5379–5397, 2013.

[16] U. Maurer and S. Wolf, "Information-theoretic key agreement: From weak to strong secrecy for free," in *Advances in CryptologyEUROCRYPT 2000*. Springer, 2000, pp. 351–368.

[17] Y. Liang, H. V. Poor *et al.*, "Information theoretic security," *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 5, no. 4–5, pp. 355–580, 2009.

[18] I. Csiszár, "Almost independence and secrecy capacity," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 48–57, 1996.

[19] I. Csiszar and J. Körner, *Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.